

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9
10 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 MARTIN DULBERG, individually, and on
12 behalf of all others similarly situated,

No. C 17-00850-WHA

13 Plaintiff,

**ORDER RE NOTICE OF
FURTHER REVISED
SETTLEMENT**

14 v.

15 UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., and RASIER,
16 LLC,

17 Defendants.
_____ /

18 The Court thanks the parties for their timely notice of further revised settlement (Dkt.
19 No. 154). After review, important details related to the proposed settlement remain unclear. It
20 is accordingly impossible to ascertain from the parties' filing whether the issues raised in the
21 prior order have been adequately addressed.

22 Still, the parties are encouraged to jointly move for preliminary approval of settlement.
23 The newly executed settlement agreement along with the proposed notice to class members (and
24 any other relevant information) should be appended to the motion. This course of action will
25 tease out remaining issues. No trial dates or deadlines will be vacated, however, until the
26 proposed settlement has been preliminarily approved.

27 The parties' notice of further revised settlement indicated that the new class notices will
28 be e-mailed to the class members. E-mailing notices is generally disfavored. The Court
cautions that if the parties wish to pursue e-mailing the notice to the class members, the motion

1 for preliminary approval should provide explanation as to why this course of action should be
2 permitted. E-mailing the class notice will not be rubber-stamped merely because it had been
3 allowed in the past. The parties are also reminded that the released claims may not be broader
4 than the certified claims.

5
6 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

7
8 Dated: May 24, 2019.

9 
10 WILIAM ALSUP
11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28